

MENT OF CIVIL

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/066,273	02/01/2002	Avi J. Ashkenazi	P3130R1C2	5808

30313 7590 04/28/2004

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

CHERNYSHEV, OLGA N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1646

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 40-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 40-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO 802)

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO 413)

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the claims

1. Claims 1-39 have been cancelled and claims 40-45 have been added as requested in the amendment submitted on March 26, 2002. Claims 40-45 are pending in the instant application.

Claims 40-45 are under examination in the instant office action.

Specification

2. The use of the trademarks has been noted in this application, see page 148, line 8, for example. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Applicant is advised to review the entire text of the instant specification for other possible use of trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 40-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is drawn to an invention with no apparent or disclosed specific and substantial credible utility. The instant

instant application does not disclose a specific biological role for these protein and antibody or their significance to a particular disease, disorder or physiological process, which one would wish to manipulate for a desired clinical effect.

It is clear from the instant application that the protein described therein is what is termed an "orphan protein" in the art. The DNA of the instant application has been isolated because of its similarity to a known DNA. There is little doubt that, after complete characterization, the encoded protein and the antibody that binds to the protein may be found to have a specific and substantial credible utility. This further characterization, however, is part of the act of invention and until it has been undertaken, Applicant's claimed invention is incomplete. The instant situation is directly analogous to that which was addressed in *Brenner v. Manson*, 148 U.S.P.Q. 689 (Sus. Ct, 1966), in which a novel compound which was structurally analogous to other compounds which were known to possess anti-cancer activity was alleged to be potentially useful as an anti-tumor agent in the absence of evidence supporting this utility. The court expressed the opinion that all chemical compounds are "useful" as it appears in 35 U.S.C. § 101, which requires that an invention must have either an immediate obvious or fully disclosed "real world" utility. The court held that:

"The basic quid pro quo contemplated by the Constitution and the Congress for granting a patent monopoly is the benefit derived by the public from an invention with substantial utility", "[u]nless and until a process is refined and developed to this point-where specific benefit exists in currently available form-there is insufficient justification for permitting an applicant to engross what may prove to be a broad field", and "a patent is not a hunting license", "[i]t is not a reward for the search, but compensation for its successful conclusion".

The instant claims are drawn to antibodies to an isolated polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 9 of as yet undetermined function or biological significance. It is clear from the instant specification that the novel polypeptide designated PRO444 is a secreted protein (page 3, lines 2-6 of the instant specification) that is encoded by a cDNA "DNA 26846-1397" of SEQ ID NO: 8 (page 27, lines 5-9), which "was isolated from a human fetal lung library using a trapping technique which selects for nucleotide sequences encoding secreted proteins" (page 65, lines 26-31). Clone DNA 26846-1397 was deposited with the ATCC and assigned number 203406 (page 104, lines 14-15). The research data presented in the instant specification indicate that PRO444 of SEQ ID NO: 9 induced the expression of *c-fos* in pericyte cells (page 142, Example 60). Based on the results of the assay disclosed in the Example 60 it was asserted that the instant PRO444 polypeptides "are useful [not only] as diagnostic markers for particular types of pericyte-associated tumors" (bottom at page 142). However, it is well described in the art that induction of *c-fos* expression represents a general cellular response to a variety of stimuli. The *c-fos* proto-oncogene is a member of the immediate-early genes (IEGs), which are rapidly induced upon stimulation of cells with growth factors, cytokines, serum or UV-light (see Janknecht et al, 1995, Introduction and p. 444, for example). In the central nervous system *c-fos* activation has been demonstrated to be induced by neurotropic factors, neurotransmitters, depolarizing agents or ion channel activating agents (Herrera et al., 1996, p. 84, first column and p. 86, second column and also Kovacs, 1998, p. 289, Mechanism of *fos* induction). It is summarized in Kovacs article that "[s]tereotypic inducibility of *c-fos* proto-oncogene rendered this cellular immediate-early gene (IEG) to be the most widely used functional anatomical mapping tool to identify cells and extended circuitries that became activated in response to various stimuli" (page 287, first

column). Thus, according to the state of the art, activation of c-fos appears to be a non-specific first line of cellular response and, therefore, one skilled in the art would readily conclude that activation of c-fos could not support the assertion that PRO444 polypeptide could be specifically used “as diagnostic marker[s] for particular types of pericyte-associated tumors”. Consequently, the assertion of the utility of the claimed antibody that binds to the PRO444 polypeptide “in diagnostic assay for PRO[444], *e.g.*, detecting its expression in specific cells, tissue, or serum” (page 98, lines 24-29) appears to be lacking evidence of record in the instant specification, as filed.

In the absence of knowledge of the biological significance of this specific PRO444 protein, there is no immediately obvious patentable use for the antibody that binds to it. According to the specification of the instant application “[A]nti-PRO antibodies are also useful for the affinity purification of PRO from recombinant cell culture or natural sources” (page 99, lines 1-2 of the instant specification). However, because at the time of filing of the instant application the specific and substantial credible utility of the PRO444 polypeptides was not established, there appears to be no pressing practical need to use the claimed antibodies to isolate PRO444. To employ the instant PRO444 protein in the methods for generation of antibodies or diagnostic assays is not a “real world” utility because it would eventually relate to a protein for which no biological function is known. To use an antibody to polypeptide PRO444 of the instant invention in any of the disclosed methods would clearly be using it as the object of further research, which has been determined by the courts to be a utility, which, alone, does not support patentability. Since the instant specification does not disclose a substantial “real world” use for

the claimed antibody to PRO444 in their currently available form, then the claimed invention is incomplete and, therefore, does not meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being useful.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 40-45 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a clear asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Claim 45 is vague and indefinite for recitation "specifically binds". The metes and bounds of the recitation cannot be determined from the claim or the instant specification because it is not clear if the specificity is defined by binding to a specific epitope, or to a protein from a particular species, or both. Clarification is required.

Conclusion

7. No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olga N. Chernyshev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0870. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9 AM to 5 PM ET.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on (571) 272-0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax center located in Crystal Mall 1 (CM1). The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). NOTE: If Applicant *does* submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by Applicant or Applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 872-9306. If this number is out of service, please call the Group receptionist for an alternative number. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (571) 273-0870. Official papers should NOT be faxed to (571) 273-0870.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Olga N. Chernyshev, Ph.D.


OLGA N. CHERNYSHEV, PH.D.
PATENT EXAMINER